

# REAUTHORIZE THE NATIONAL POISON CONTROL INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. TOWNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOWNS. Yesterday, I introduced legislation with LEE TERRY from Nebraska to provide for the reauthorization of the Poison Control Center. Since being codified into law in 2000, the Poison Control Centers must undergo reauthorization every 3 years. These centers provide immediate value to the public, providing free medical facilities that are staffed by toxicologists, nurses, and other professionals.

Each year, poisoning results in 285,000 hospitalizations, 1,200 days of acute hospital care, and 1,300 fatalities. H.R. 5669 will reauthorize these critical Poison Control Centers to keep our national public health infrastructure in tact. I would like to thank Congressman TERRY for this support.

The 24-hour emergency and information hotline services that are provided for this legislation are given by the National Poison Center Toll-Free Telephone number. By providing direct patient care services to residential callers, health care professionals and institutions, Poison Control Centers save lives and help avoid costly hospitalizations. Let us keep that in mind as we move forward and reauthorize the Poison Control Centers.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□ 1615

## AMERICAN DEATH TOLL IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when the American death toll in Iraq hit 4,000 on March 23, there was a great deal of coverage about it in the media. But the media only seems to care about the death toll when it reaches a special milestone. But now that the number of dead has reached 4,012, they have packed up their cameras, they have gone back to ignoring Iraq. Once again, our brave soldiers are dying in virtual anonymity, surely paying the highest price.

Here at home, the administration's occupation policies are harming American people in other ways. I am talking about the millions of Americans who are suffering because we are spending our Nation's treasure in Iraq rather than on vitally-needed social and economic programs here at home. We're spending about \$4,600 every second on

the occupation, or about \$12 billion a month.

Joseph Stiglitz, the Nobel Prize winning economist, has calculated that the occupation will ultimately cost \$3 trillion, and that, Mr. Speaker, is a conservative estimate. And it will certainly cost a whole lot more if the administration gets its way and we establish permanent bases in Iraq or the others get their way and we remain involved in Iraq for 50 to 100 years.

This enormous drain on our resources has buried us so deeply in debt that we cannot make investments in the programs that would really move our Nation forward. Just think of what we could do with all of those trillions of dollars.

We could invest in the education of the 48 million children in our public schools. We could prepare them to compete and win in the global economy.

We could invest in early childhood education and the childcare that millions of poor and middle-class families so desperately need.

We could invest in the medical research needed to cure disease and to save millions of Americans from needless suffering and from premature death.

We could invest in our infrastructure and new green technologies which could produce millions of jobs around our Nation.

We could produce an economic stimulus package to fulfill remaining unmet needs.

We could help States and cities to provide their first responders with the equipment they need to save lives in the event of terrorism or natural disasters.

We could build more affordable housing and assist those who have been caught up in the mortgage meltdown.

We could provide health care to our citizens, starting with SCHIP for our children.

We could move to ensure the solvency of Social Security.

We could invest in global health. As a member of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, I can tell you that every single dollar spent on global health is a dollar spent to make our world more peaceful and stable.

These are just a few examples, Mr. Speaker. We couldn't do them all, but if we did just a few, we would go much further toward safeguarding our national security than we are currently doing in Iraq.

I hope my colleagues will remember this when General Petraeus arrives next week with his bar charts and statistics. Let us remember that the turmoil in the Middle East is helping to spike gas prices at the pump. It is leading us deeper and deeper into the effects of the Iraq recession.

The responsible redeployment of our troops out of Iraq is the one policy that makes sense, and the one policy that the great majority of the American

people support. It is high time for us to do what the American people expect us to do, and they expect us to end our occupation of Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF IRAQ ON THE NATIONAL SECURITY OF AMERICA IS NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESTAK. Shortly, General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker will come before the House and the Senate to provide an update on the military and the political situation in Iraq. That is my grave concern, that once again we will have placed a man who is responsible for the security, the military security only, of Iraq, in the position, in the singular position, of determining the national security policy of the United States and the public's perception of it, when what is needed, what is direly needed, is a comprehensive assessment of the national security of America and the impact of the strategy we have in Iraq upon it. So in fact it is the questions that General Petraeus cannot or should not answer that are the most important ones.

For example, the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be asked directly, what is the impact of Iraq upon the military's readiness to deploy and meet the required timelines of its various war plans, when in fact today it cannot deploy its forces, its army, in order to protect the 28,000 men and women who wear the cloth of our Nation in South Korea from an attack on the timelines required by North Korea against the South?

And while before Iraq we actually trained on multiple areas of warfare, for the past 3 years your army has only been training in counterinsurgency. The Joint Chiefs of Staff must address the impact of 3 years of its army training only in one warfare area and being unable to meet any timeline of any war plan by its army in America's arsenal of war plans.

Then, in the long term, the impact of 42 percent of our men and women who we are recruiting today being less capable than ever of being able to operate